

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/892,242	06/26/2001	Zheng Qi	1875.9090002	3440
26111	7590 11/13/2006		EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			PICH, PONNOREAY	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2135	

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/892,242	QI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Ponnoreay Pich	2135	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 23 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. 🛛 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). **NOTICE OF APPEAL** 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** will be entered in part 3. 🔀 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, w<del>ill not be entered</del> because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

ore entered in Port

7. 
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1,4-8,13-19,21,23,27-34,36,38,41 and 42. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>3,25,26,39,40 and 43</u>. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Amendments to claims 3, 25, 39, and 40 are not entered as they change the scope of the claims and would require further search and/or consideration by the examiner. Claims 3 and 25, use to recite that "the cryptography engine is a DES engine". The amendment has made it so that the claim recites that the engine implements a "DES-compatible algorithm". This broadens the scope of the claims since other engines besides DES engines would have to be considered whereas before only DES engines had to be considered. Further, the examiner would have to consider what is "DES-compatible" and if one skilled in the art would understand the phrase--this would require further consideration of the specification (to see if the specification defined what it means for an algorithm to be DES-compatible) and most likely an updated search to determine if the phrase is a part of the standard vocabulary of one of ordinary skill in the art. Changes in the claims to recite "block cipher algorithm" from DES in claims 39 and 40 broaden the claims, which would also require an updated search. Amendments to claims 4 and 42 are entered as they only affect the form of the claims without changing the scope. Confirmation of an election made by applicant was noted.

A KIM AN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100